DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 460 623 FL 025 595

AUTHOR Halmari, Helena; Cooper, Robert
TITLE Patterns of English-Finnish Codeswitching in Finland and in the United States.
PUB DATE 1998-00-00
NOTE 17p.; In: Puolin ja toisin: Suomalais-virolaista kielentutkimusta. AFinLAn vuosikirja 1998 (On Both Sides: Finnish-Estonian Research on Language. AFinLA Yearbook 1998); see FL 025 589. Paper presented at "Linguistics in Estonia and Finland: Crossing the Gulf" Symposium (Tallinn, Estonia, November 14-15, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Bilingualism; *Code Switching (Language); *English; *Finnish; Foreign Countries; Grammar; *Language Patterns; Language Universals; Oral Language; Syntax
IDENTIFIERS Finland; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper investigates the intrasentential codeswitching patterns of two sets of English-Finnish bilingual teenagers in a corpus of 208 bilingual sentences. Two of the subjects live in Finland and two in the United States; therefore, the macro-sociolinguistic situations for them are reverse. For those living in the United States, the minority language is Finnish. Despite the fact that the subjects belong to two different, geographically far apart speech communities, their codeswitching patterns appear to be surprisingly similar. The investigation into the explanation of the similarities of their codeswitching patterns underscores the role of the two unifying forces: on one hand, formal syntax and universal grammar seem to provide the general guidelines for switching; on the other hand, the similarities are explained by the need in every speaker to look for the best and the most accurate expressions to convey the meanings attempted during the flow of spontaneous conversation. (Author/VWL)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 460 623

Luukka, M.-R., S. Salla & H. Dufva (toim.) 1998. Puolin ja toisin. AFinLAn vuosikirja 1998. Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistyksen julkaisuja no. 56. Jyväskylä. s. 85–99.

PATTERNS OF ENGLISH-FINNISH CODESWITCHING IN FINLAND AND IN THE UNITED STATES.

Helena Halmari, Sam Houston State University
Robert Cooper, University of Tampere

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Katja Mantyla

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL025395

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Luukka, M. R., S. Salla & H. Dufva (toim.) 1998. Puolin ja toisin. AFinLAn vuosikirja 1998. Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistyksen julkaisuja no. 56. Jyväskylä. s. 85–99.

PATTERNS OF ENGLISH-FINNISH CODESWITCHING IN FINLAND AND IN THE UNITED STATES.

Helena Halmari, Sam Houston State University
Robert Cooper, University of Tampere

In this paper we investigate the intrasentential codeswitching patterns of two sets of English-Finnish bilingual teenagers in a corpus of 208 bilingual sentences. Two of our subjects live in Finland and two in the United States; therefore, the macro-sociolinguistic situations for them are reversed: for those living in Finland, English is the minority language while for those in the United States, the minority language is Finnish. Despite the fact that our subjects belong to two different, geographically far-apart speech communities, their codeswitching patterns appear to be surprisingly similar. Our investigation into the explanation of the similarities of their codeswitching patters underscores the role of two unifying forces: on the one hand, formal syntax and Universal Grammar seem to provide the general guidelines for switching; on the other hand, the similarities are explained by the need in every speaker to look for the best and the most accurate expressions to convey the meanings attempted during the flow of spontaneous conversation.

Keywords: codeswitching, bilingualism, English-Finnish language contact, Universal Grammar

1 INTRODUCTION

Bilingual codeswitching, the mixing of two (or more) languages within the same conversational exchange and also within the same sentence, has proven to provide intriguing insights into the workings of the bilingual mind, the interplay between the two grammatical systems, and the role of sociolinguistic factors in how the two languages are mixed. The history of codeswitching studies has provided a sizeable list of both the **sociolinguistic or rhetorical functions** for codeswitching (see e.g. Gumperz 1982, Hatch 1976) and the possible **syntactic constraints** for it (e.g. Sankoff & Poplack 1981, Woolford 1983, Di Sciullo, Myusken & Singh 1986, Myers-Scotton 1993, Belazi, Rubin & Toribio 1994, just to mention a few). The sometimes contrasting and controversial results within the field have, for a large part, been caused by the fact that different researchers have been basing their conclusions on data

sets that are not necessarily compatible: they have looked at different language pairs, and the language of speakers in different speech communities, but in addition, the data have often been gathered in inherently dissimilar speech situations, or the methods of data-gathering have been different. Yet the nineteen-nineties have, in a sense, marked a change in codeswitching research, earlier plagued by hasty overgeneralization and disagreement.

Realizing the state of "confusion" in the field, Muysken called in 1991 for a **comparative approach** to codeswitching research. The goal would be to look systematically at small sets of comparable data, where as many variables as possible are kept constant. Ideally, this approach would allow us to focus on the influence of one variable only (be it typological differences, bilingual community norms, or the role of the majority language – all areas which can potentially cause variation in codeswitching patterns). Some researchers have already responded to the call for a comparative approach when looking at codeswitching data (see e.g. Boeschoten 1991, Backus 1992, Treffers-Daller 1992, Bentahila & Davies 1995). The present paper intends to take this comparative approach as well: we will focus on one language pair (English/Finnish) and will investigate a restricted set of codeswitching data gathered from two restricted, yet comparable groups of English-Finnish bilingual teenagers in reasonably comparable situations. One subset of our data was gathered in naturally occurring, spontaneous speech situations in Finland, and the second subset under similar circumstances in the United States. Thus, we are looking at the same pair of languages and codeswitchers of comparable age groups. The major difference between our two subgroups of subjects comes from the reversed sociolinguistic roles of their two languages: for Paul and Helen, who live in Finland, English is the minority language; for Iiris and Irene, who live in the United States, English is the majority language.

This paper focuses solely on sentence-internal switching patterns in English matrix sentences into which Finnish elements are being inserted. (While switching in the opposite direction – the insertion of English elements into Finnish matrix sentences is common in the language of all our four subjects and also follows similar patterns, we are here focusing on English-Finnish switches only. The Finnish-English intrasentential switches by our American Finnish subjects have been described and analyzed in Halmari 1997). We aim at addressing the following two questions: Firstly, does the change in the majority language (in one case Finnish, in the other, English) affect the codeswitching patterns of our subjects? Secondly, since our two sets of subjects have grown up not only in different macro-sociolinguistic environments, but may also have been influenced by different speech community norms (e.g. family lects – cf. Lanza 1997: 8) and since they have never met each other, will this have resulted in differing codeswitching patterns? We argue that if – despite the geographical distance and the possible diffe-

rences in surrounding bilingual speech community norms – bilingual teenagers in Finland and in the United States share certain codeswitching patterns, some universal regulating force or forces must be responsible for these similarities. Specifically, we claim that two major forces interact and play major roles in the production of bilingual speech: (1) the strong sentence-internal syntagmatic relations that have their basis in Universal Grammar and (2) the ever-present need of all speakers (not only bilinguals) to look for the best, most suitable expressions, regardless of their linguistic origin. We will look at both of these regulating forces separately, but let us first say a few words about our subjects and our data.

2 THE SUBJECTS AND THE DATA

The bilinguals living in Finland are Helen, who during the data-gathering was fourteen to fifteen years of age, and her younger brother Paul, who was between eleven and twelve. The mother is Finnish and the father is British, but both parents are bilingual in English and Finnish. Both languages are used regularly within the family: the children address their father in English and their mother in Finnish. When speaking to each other, Helen and Paul use Finnish, but they do mix English in their Finnish; this is mostly done for rhetorical purposes. The estimated distribution of the two household languages is approximately half and half.

Our bilinguals in the United States are Iiris and Irene, who during the data-gathering were between thirteen to fifteen and twelve to fourteen years of age, respectively. Both of their parents speak Finnish as their first language, but the family has lived in the United States since the girls were six and seven years of age. As in the case of Paul and Helen in Finland (who also use the majority language, Finnish, while at home), Iiris and Irene also use mostly English, their societal majority language, when talking to each other or their older brother at home, and while the father is always addressed in Finnish (as Helen and Paul's father is in English), the mother is mostly addressed in English (even though she tends to respond in Finnish). Mixing languages between sentences takes the same patterns as with Helen and Paul: it is often done for rhetorical purposes (jokes, emphasis, quarreling). The overall distribution of the two languages in the household is also approximately fifty percent Finnish and fifty percent English.

The patterns of family bilingualism – "bilingualism within the family in which two languages are spoken" (Lanza 1997: 10) – are rarely identical; in our case, for instance, only the father of Helen and Paul has English as his L1 and, therefore, the bilingual situations and early childhood language exposure of our bilingual teenagers are not, in that regard, comparable. As emphasized by Lanza, the patterns of family bilingualism "are central in the

examination of the bilingual child's language socialization" (1997: 10) and different patterns of exposure may, of course, lead to differing distributions of the two languages and differing patterns of language mixing. However, since we are finding similarities (which we want to explicate), and not differences, our claim is that the parents' backgrounds and proficiencies in the two languages as well as the early language exposure patterns (in Helen and Paul's case, simultaneous acquisition of the two languages, and in Iiris and Irene's case, successive acquisition of the two languages) do not seem to cause differences in codeswitching patterns, nor does the macro-sociolinguistic situation. Both Helen and Paul in Finland and Iiris and Irene in the United States mix their two languages in both directions and according to the same syntactic principles. In the data that form the basis for this paper, within English conversations, Finnish lexical elements are inserted into the English sentences **without distorting the syntax of either language**. The following sentences from Paul and Irene are examples (for the sake of clarity, the names of our subjects living in Finland are followed by F and the names of the subjects in the United States are followed by US):

(1) Paul: ... he'd **won a** *palkinto* for being the best *ohjaaja*
"prize" "director" (Paul/F 30,31)

(2) Irene: I always tell Iiris to **put the** *päiväpeitto* on her bed so that the cats
"bedspread"
won't come and lay their eggs on there. (Irene/US 12/5/94)

Our data are part of two longitudinal codeswitching data sets collected by each author. The sentences for this paper were drawn from the years 1994–96, and they consist of **208 intrasentential codeswitches into Finnish within English sentences**. The data were gathered in the following manner: the sentences were written down immediately after they occurred during the on-going, spontaneous discourse which the authors took part in or observed. Thus, all the sentences have occurred naturally and spontaneously, in the flow of discourse, and without elicitation. While recording the sentences by writing them down immediately after their occurrence will not allow us to go back and re-listen to them, we have found that this method of data gathering allows us to access language-mixing patterns which are guaranteed to be uninhibited by the presence of the tape-recorder or the video-camera.[1]

[1] As rightly pointed out by an anonymous reviewer of this article, investigating isolated sentences drawn from flowing spontaneous conversation is problematic in that it does not allow us to look at the role of prosody and discourse context in these bilingual sentences. However, our goal here is to focus on syntagmatic relations and/or lexical choice. For articles on the discourse features of our Finnish American subjects, see Halmari 1993a and Halmari & Smith 1994. The latter article also touches the issue of prosody and its function as one of the several contextualization cues in bilingual conversation.

As we will show, the switching patterns are qualitatively surprisingly similar; yet there are some quantitative differences in how much our subjects switch. Helen, the older sibling of our subjects in Finland, tends to keep her two languages more compartmentalized and she attempts (even consciously, as some word-searches indicate) to address her father using only English; therefore, from Helen, we have only nineteen instances of intrasentential codeswitches where Finnish words are inserted into English sentences. This, we argue, is mainly due to the fact that since early childhood, Helen became used to addressing her father in more or less monolingual English. The younger sibling, Paul, on the other hand, mixes his two languages freely and frequently, in the same way that Iiris and Irene do. From Paul we have ninety-two Finnish insertions into English sentences; from Iiris and Irene together ninety-seven (Table 1):

TABLE 1. The subjects and the number of switches into Finnish.

	Age	Number of Finnish insertions into English sentences
Bilinguals in Finland		
Paul	11–12	92
Helen	14–15	19
Bilinguals in the U.S.		
Irene	12–14	49
Iiris	13–15	48
Total		208

3 THE ROLE OF UNIVERSAL GRAMMAR IN BILINGUAL CODESWITCHING

In addition to sentences (1–2) above, the following sentences (3–7) are prototypical examples produced by Finnish/English bilinguals (see e.g. Lehtinen 1966, Hirvonen 1985, Pietilä 1989, Lauttamus 1991, 1992, Halmari 1997) and other language pairs exhibit the same pattern (see e.g. Oksaar 1972 for Estonian/Swedish and Estonian/English, Myers-Scotton 1993 for codeswitching between different African languages, Hassinen 1997 for Estonian/Finnish, and Andersson 1992 and Boyd 1993 for Finnish/Swedish, just to mention a few). Words and phrases from the so-called embedded language are inserted into the so-called matrix language according to very similar principles. Examples (3–7) illustrate the switching patterns in those bilingual

sentences which are the focus of this paper: English matrix sentences into which Finnish lexical elements have been inserted:

(3) It's horrible when they give you an injection at the dentist's. **The** *neulänkärki* "needle point" **is** nowhere near the tooth and afterwards your whole mouth is *puutunut*. "numb" (Paul/F 45,46)

(4) If you're going to the shops, Dad, could you **get** me **some** *hiusmuotoiluvaahto*? "hair styling mousse" (Helen/F 1)

(5) Can you **put that** *viltti* in there--on there. "blanket" (Iiris/US 1/26/95)

(6) Mom, there's a vacuum cleaner **in the** *eteinen*. "hall" (Irene/US 12/26/94)

(7) Could I just wash my hands *tässä vaiheessa*? "at this point" (Iiris/US 6/6/94)

All these are English sentences, despite the fact that Finnish lexical elements have been inserted into them. The insertion follows a clear pattern (for details, see Halmari 1997): the functional elements, such as determiners – as *the* in (3) and (6), *some* in (4), and *that* in (5) – tend to come from the matrix language, English, whereas the content words (nouns such as *neulänkärki* "needle point," *hiusmuotoiluvaahto* "hair shaping mousse," *viltti* "blanket," *eteinen* "hall," the adjectival past participle *puutunut* "numb," and adjunct phrases (*tässä vaiheessa* "at this point") are inserted from Finnish, the embedded language. This follows the pattern which has been formalized as the Matrix Language Frame Model by Myers-Scotton (1993) and which we claim adheres to a somewhat more specifically definable syntactic principle, namely that when there is a case-assignment or agreement relation between two sentence elements, the element which is to be assigned case, needs to include a so-called language-carrying element, the language of which is going to be the same as the language of the case-assigner. In Chomsky's Government and Binding approach this strong syntagmatic relationship between the case-assigner and the case-assignee is referred to as "the principle of government" (see Chomsky 1988; and for details in codeswitching data, Di Sciullo, Muysken & Singh 1986, also Halmari 1993b and 1997). Thus, for instance, in (3) the subject NP *the neulänkärki* needs to have the English determiner, because it is assigned case (nominative) by the INFL of the verb – the English is – either under government or under spec-head agreement (see e.g. Haegeman 1995: 166, 178n10). The second switch in example (3) is the subject complement *puutunut* "numb" in the clause "afterwards your whole mouth is *puutunut*." The phrase *puutunut* can be entirely in Finnish (without any English language-carrying elements) because copulas (here the

preceding English *is*) are not case-assigning verbs. In (4) the direct object NP *some hiusmuotoiluvaahto* "some hair styling mousse" is governed and assigned case by the English verb *get*; therefore we find the English language-carrying determiner *some*. The same applies to (5): the language of the case-assigning verb *put* needs to match the language of the determiner (*that*) in the NP to which it assigns case. In (6), within the prepositional phrase *in the eteinen* "in the hall" the object of the preposition *the eteinen* has a functional element (the determiner *the*) from English to serve as the language-carrying element to tie the object of the preposition to the language of its governing preposition *in* (in other words, *in* and *the* need to match; *eteinen* can come from Finnish). Sentence (7) is an example of a switched adjunct *tässä vaiheessa* "at this point." Since adjuncts are not governed by any sentential elements from outside their own phrasal boundaries, this adjunct, for instance, does not have to include any English elements; it can be monolingually Finnish.

The above-described syntactic tendency is a strong one. It means that we can talk in terms of "acceptable" and "unacceptable" codeswitches in the same way that we can talk about acceptable and unacceptable structures in ordinary monolingual discourse. Thus sentence (3) above could not, we claim, have the Finnish word *neulankärki* ("needle point") without the English article:

(3') **Neulankärki* is nowhere near the tooth.
"Needle point"

and sentence (4) could not be in the following form

(4') *... could you get me *vähän hiusmuotoiluvaahtoa*?
"some hair styling mousse"

with a Finnish determiner-like element *vähän* as opposed to the English one (*some*), since the language of *vähän* would not "match" with the language of the English case-assigning verb *get*. This, we believe, is because codeswitching has its roots in Universal Grammar (UG) and we claim that UG regulates, to a great extent, bilingual sentence production[2]. This leads to an overall impression of a matrix language and accounts for the fact that the bilingual sentences of our subjects, for instance, whom no-one has taught to codeswitch and whom the Atlantic Ocean separates, follow the same syntactic patterns[3].

---

[2] Due to space limitations, the full technical details of the realization of this UG-based principle have been omitted here. We refer the interested reader to Di Sciullo, Muysken & Singh 1986 and Halmari 1993b, 1997.

[3] This syntactic constraint also leads to a pattern of mixing which looks almost (if not completely) identical to borrowing, and has led some researchers to claim that it, in fact, is borrowing (Poplack, Wheeler & Westwood 1987 call it "nonce borrowing"); others (e.g. Lauttamus 1991, 1992) claim that codeswitching and borrowing are the opposite ends of the same continuum.

If Universal Grammar sets the deep abstract principles of language (e.g. Chomsky 1988), it should also play a role in bilingual competence – as reflected in bilingual language production. However, while many similarities in bilingual sentences can be accounted for by the adherence of these sentences to the principles of Universal Grammar, we claim that bilingual sentences also reflect another strong tendency. This tendendy is dictated by the universally shared need in all speakers to look for the best possible expressions to match the meanings to be conveyed.

4 THE ROLE OF THE NEED FOR EFFICIENT COMMUNICATION

While bilinguals are to a great extent guided and even constrained by the principles of language switching that find their origin in Universal Grammar, we argue that in addition to grammatical principles as regulators of monolingual as well as bilingual speech production, the ever-present need to look for the best, most efficient and most effective means of communication might be another guiding force in both mono- and bilingual speech production. This is a force that, at the level of on-line production, possibly interacts with the forces at the level of syntax.

The need to look for the best possible words to express the ideas to be communicated was noted early on by Leopold (1949), who in his often-cited classic diary study of bilingual language acquisition writes about his infant daughter Hildegard that: "[...] she chose words from both languages as carriers of her communications, and combined them into utterances with no regard for their linguistic provenience [*sic*]" (Leopold 1949: 186; see also Lindholm & Padilla 1978: 334). When we start looking at what **kind of** Finnish content morphemes our subjects insert into their English sentences, we quite often find that these are not just any Finnish content words used at random (even though this also sometimes is the case). Below, we will give examples of different kinds of switches which may all be triggered by different immediate factors; however, while recognizing the fact that speculation on psychological processes such as speech motivations will necessarily lack empirical verification, we claim that no matter which language a bilingual resorts to, one of the bottom line general motivations could be the desire to achieve fluent, effective communication.

4.1 Individual lexical gaps

The most obvious reason for the insertion of lexical elements from Finnish is, naturally, a lexical gap in the vocabulary of the speaker. Due to the compart-

mentalization of the use of their two languages, our subjects do not have an identical command of English and Finnish in all the areas of life. (In fact, few people are equally fluent in every area of life, even if they are monolingual speakers). Sentence (8) is not an example of language-mixing *per se*; rather, it stands as an example of metalinguistic talk and we are including it to emphasize the obvious role of individual lexical gaps as triggers for language switching. Paul is clearly reluctant to codeswitch here; he **doesn't want** to insert the Finnish word *asiantuntija* in the ongoing monolingual English conversation. But, paradoxically, in order to avoid codeswitching, he needs to resort to a metalinguistic question, which by definition includes a switch; i.e. he "sidesteps" from the flow of conversation in order to ask what *asiantuntija* is in English. Note again the indefinite article *an* in front of the switched element:

(8) Paul: Last night ... -What do you call an *asiantuntija*?
Dad: An expert.
Paul: Last night, an expert said that ... (Paul/F 6)

In (8), the explicit question provides direct evidence of the lexical gap in Paul's vocabulary. This type of metalinguistic talk is quite usual in any multilingual family, and we want to underscore that this is not really an instance of "voluntary" codeswitching. It is, rather, a case where codeswitching takes place as a last resort.

4.2 Temporary individual gaps

Example (8) above is an example of a clear lexical gap which, in a bilingual situation, will trigger a switch of language, unless the speaker comes up with a circumlocution. Sometimes the lexical gap is a temporary one. The bilingual knows both words, but the Finnish word in that particular speech situation (for whatever reason) is accessed faster:

(9) Somebody wanna **hand** me **the** *kartta*. *Map*. (Irene/US 6/12/94)
(10) You **stole my** *sanat*. *Words*. (Irene/US 7/4/95)
(11) Dad: What's this magazine, Helen?
Helen: Nothing important. It's **for the** *paperikerays*. It's *waste-paper*. (Helen/F/6)

In (9–11), both Irene and Helen, after the switched word, resort to immediate self-repair: Irene provides the exact equivalent for the switched (more quickly accessed) Finnish word: the words *map* (9) and *words* (10) are direct translation equivalents for the Finnish words *kartta* and *sanat*, respectively. In (11), the exact translation for *paperikerays* would be, e.g., "waste-paper collection" and this meaning is well conveyed by Helen's quick added remark

which contains the central notion: waste-paper. It is to be noted that all the above examples (8–11) adhere to the syntactic principle of language mixing: all the switched Finnish words are preceded by English functional elements – here the English determiners – which function as language-carriers. In (9), for instance, we do not have "*?Somebody wanna hand me *kartta/kartan*" with the governed object NP completely in Finnish. The definite article in front of *kartta* cannot be omitted, since it is needed to function as a language carrier. Similarly, we do not have "*?You stole *mun sanat*" with the governed direct object completely in Finnish; the determiner *mun* "my" would need to be in the same language as the verb.

All the examples in (9–11) can be seen as indications of the bilingual speakers' underlying need to draw lexical material primarily from one and the same language. This need is sometimes dictated by the speech situation: the speaker is in the "English-speaking mode," rather than the "Finnish-speaking mode." In situations triggering the monolingual mode, this primary need (if maximally fulfilled) would normally lead to monolingual language production; however, these examples (9–11) illustrate that lexical access in bilingual speakers is sometimes blocked by the other-language material which is (maybe accidentally) accessed faster (see also Lindholm & Padilla 1978). This accidental access to the embedded language lexicon is demonstrated explicitly by the fact that even when the bilingual does not self-repair the switched word by giving a translation equivalent as above, they **know** in most cases what the English word would be. In examples (12) and (13) below, after having switched into Finnish within their English matrix sentences, the speakers were casually asked whether they knew the switched word in English. In the case of (12), Irene produced the word *sheet* immediately and when asked why she had just seconds previously used the Finnish word *lakana+s* (inflected for the English plural), she answered that she had forgotten what it was in English. After Iiris had produced (13), she was, again casually, asked why she had not said *lane* instead of the Finnish *kaista*. She answered that she had not remembered the English word. Example (14) illustrates a stretch of discourse between the codeswitcher and the ever-curious codeswitching researcher:

(12) I **changed my** *lakanas*, and I'm actually gonna start making my bed again.
sheet+PL (Irene/US 9/15/96)

(13) How come you didn't go **on the other** *kaista*?
"lane" (Iiris/US 1/18/96)

(14) Iiris: I **have a** *mustelma* here.
Mom: What's "mustelma" in English?
Iiris: I think it's bruise. (Iiris/US 20/9/96)

In these cases the Finnish word was accessed faster and since the situation was bilingual, it did not outlaw the use of the Finnish word (the other interlocutors were mixing the two languages as well).

The switches here again adhere to the UG-principles (or tendencies) of language mixing: they are preceded by language-carrying elements. Comparison of examples (10) and (12) does reveal an interesting morphological detail, however: in (12) the English plural ending has been attached to the Finnish word: *lakana+s*, while in (10) the word *sana+t* carries Finnish inflectional morphology. Variation in the source of the plural inflection--whether from English (*lakana+**s***) or from Finnish (*sana+**t***) seems to be allowed as long as the UG-based requirement for the presence of **one or more** language carriers in case-assigned phrases is satisfied. In (10) above, the case-assigning English verb *stole* requires its direct object to include an English language-carrying element; this requirement is satisfied by the presence of the English determiner *my*; thus, the head noun *sanat* no longer necessarily needs the English plural as a language carrier. In (12), on the other hand, the speaker chose to include two English markers, the determiner *my* and the English plural inflection: *my lakana+s*. Similar variation can be seen in (19) and (20) below.

4.3 Connotative mismatches

Sometimes the lexical gap is not an individual lexical gap, but rather, there is a mismatch in the connotations between the English and the Finnish elements (see e.g. Myers-Scotton & Jake 1995, Malakoff & Hakuta 1991: 146), and the exact meaning of the concept is simply better and more accurately communicated in one language or the other. Several of our mixed sentences are illustrations of switching due to the fact that the Finnish words are better suited to communicate the exact meanings intended than the (more or less vaguely) corresponding English words:

(15) There was some *kermaviili* left over, so I'm **making a** *maustekakku*. (Helen/F 7,8)

(16) Guess what I put **in this** *viili* ...? (Paul/F 39)

(17) One **of the** *isoset* is half English--his mother comes from Wolverhampton. (Helen/F16)

(18) Look at that post over there. You can **see a** *lumihiutale* on it. (Paul/F 13)

While the words *kermaviili* (15) and *viili* (16) could, in theory, be translated into English as "sour cream" and "soured whole milk," for the bilingual speaker in Finland, the most adequate means of referring to these food items is clearly the use of the original Finnish words. When baking a Finnish "spice

cake" in Finland, using a Finnish recipe, the best, the most accurate, and the most adequate word to refer to it, is the Finnish word *maustekakku* (15). In (17), the word *isoset* (roughly – but not quite accurately translated as the "big ones") has a special meaning referring to youth leaders working on Finnish Lutheran confirmation camps – these *isoset* are quite often only a year older than the campers themselves and have been confirmed the previous year. There is no better way to refer to this concept than to use the Finnish word. (18) is a somewhat different case: an obvious equivalent for *lumihiutale* exists: "snow flake." However, for our bilingual speaker, familiar with both British and Finnish winters, Finnish snow flakes clearly carry some special distinguishing connotative quality; hence, the switch.

The following examples are further illustrations of similar connotative gaps between English and Finnish as triggers of mixed utterances. These sentences come from the speech of our subjects living in the United States:

(19) You **take these two** *ukkelit*, and you put them behind your back.
(Irene/US 11/28/94)
(20) They **have** always *hepulis*. (Irene/US 11/23/94)
(21) And it's also that I don't *viihdy* here. (Iiris/US 10/30/96)
(22) That's because I didn't **have any** ... *lihapullaa* with it. (Irene/US 1/28/96)

None of the italicized Finnish words have true English equivalents with exactly the same connotations. *Ukkelit* has the approximate meaning of "little, oldish, guys" (the speaker is referring to small plastic toys found inside cereal boxes); *hepuli* is a "giggling fit" but *hepuli* is just a funnier word. The Finnish verb *viihtyä* can be translated as "be/feel happy" but there is no one word in English with this exact meaning. And when referring to meatballs made using a Finnish recipe, what would be a better word to refer to them than the Nordic *lihapulla*?

Finally, compare the bilingual girls Helen and Irene involved in baking, one in Tampere, the other in Texas:

(23) Dad: Are you coming in here, Helen?
Helen: Yes, but only to **make some** *piparkakkutaikina*. (Helen/F H5)
(24) Mom, could you **put some** *jauhoo* to this? (Irene/US 3/16/96)

Both girls know the words for gingerbread-dough and flour (Helen explicitly uses the word *gingerbread* within the same discourse.) However, it is the baking activity which causes the activation of the Finnish content words and triggers the switching – it is a "universal" of a different level: with their

respective Finnish-speaking mothers, both girls have learned to bake "in Finnish."[4]

4.4 Previous discourse triggering the mix

Another possible reason for Finnish words popping up in English sentences is a discourse-related one. The Finnish word may be made more readily accessible to the bilingual speaker due to the fact that it has just occurred in the immediately preceding monolingual Finnish turn.

(25) Dad: Se oli *piilossa*.
Iiris: Well, it wasn't a very good *piilo*. (Iiris/US 20/8/96)
(26) Mom: Haluaks sää *maustaakin sen*?
Iiris: Oh YOU could *maustaa sen*. (Iiris/US 2/27/96)
(27) Irene: Katotaanko vielä jos löytyy *vitivalkonen*. I **want a** *vitivalkonen*.
(Irene/US 7/7/95)

Examples (25) and (26) are illustrations of Iiris responding with an English sentence to the previous Finnish discourse turns. However, in both instances the content word *piilo* "hiding place" and the whole phrase *maustaa sen* "season/spice it" are in Finnish, most likely due to the fact that they had just appeared in Finnish in the previous speakers' turns and were thus easily accessible. Example (27) is Irene's bilingual discourse turn. She is looking for a pure white chair for her room in a furniture store. Her first sentence is in Finnish; her second sentence is in English. However, the Finnish word *vitivalkonen* in the first sentence triggers her to repeat it in Finnish in her second sentence as well, rather than translate it into English to produce a monolingual English sentence. Also, the term *vitivalkonen* may have been inserted into the English sentence not only because it occurred in the speaker's previous sentence but perhaps also because of a slight connotative gap: the intensifying *viti* is not exactly the same as "pure white," which would be "puhtaan valkoinen". There is rarely just one explanation for language mixing.

---

[4] Note the variation in the realization of the Finnish partitive ending: in (23) *piparkakkutaikina* "gingerbread-dough" has no overt case ending; (24) is marked for the Finnish partitive (*jauho+a* "flour+PARTITIVE"). Since the element *some* in both instances fulfills the requirement for the language carrier, this variation is possible.

5 SUMMARY

Our data indicate that the overall similarities in the codeswitching patterns of the two sets of teenagers (in Finland and in the United States) are quite striking. Finnish words are inserted into English sentences according to the same syntactic principles on both sides of the Atlantic. This fact rules out the surrounding local speech community as a major influence regulating codeswitching patterns and leads us to look for an account for what seem to be universal tendencies within two major areas: in the role of strong sentence-internal syntagmatic relations that have their basis in Universal Grammar and in the role of the ever-present need of all speakers (not only bilinguals) to look for the best, most appropriate expressions, regardless of their linguistic origin.

References

Andersson, P. 1992. Children's code-switching and the dynamics of language dominance. In *Code-switching summer school.* (Pavia, Italy, 9–12 September 1992.) Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 263–265.

Backus, A. 1992. Variation in codeswitching patterns. In *Code-switching summer school.* (Pavia, Italy, 9–12 September 1992.) Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 251–262.

Belazi, H.M., E.J. Rubin & A.J. Toribio 1994. Code switching and X-bar theory: the Functional Head Constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25 (2), 221–237.

Bentahila, A. & E.E. Davies 1995. Patterns of code-switching and patterns of language contact. *Lingua* 96, 75–93.

Boeschoten, H. 1991. Asymmetrical code-switching in immigrant communities. In *Papers for the workshop on constraint, conditions and models.* (London, 27-29 September 1990.) Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 85–100.

Boyd, S. 1993. Attrition or expansion? Changes in the lexicon of Finnish and American adult bilinguals in Sweden. In K. Hyltenstam & Å. Viberg (eds.) *Progression and regression in language: sociocultural, neuropsychological, and linguistic perspectives.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 386–411.

Chomsky, N. 1988. *Lectures on government and binding: the Pisa lectures.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Di Sciullo, A.-M., P. Muysken & R. Singh 1986. Government and code-mixing. *Journal of Linguistics* 22, 1–24.

Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse strategies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haegeman, L. 1995. *Introduction to government and binding theory.* 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell.

Halmari, H. 1993a. Code-switching as an evaluative device in bilingual discourse. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 4 (1), 91–118.

Halmari, H. 1993b. Structural relations and Finnish-English bilingual code-switching. *Linguistics* 31 (6), 1043–1068.

Halmari, H. 1997. *Government and codeswitching: explaining American Finnish.* Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Halmari, H. & W. Smith 1994. Code-switching and register shift: evidence from Finnish-English child bilingual conversation. *Journal of Pragmatics* 21 (4). 427– 445.

Hassinen, S. 1997. Bilingualism in closely related languages. Ms. University of Oulu.

Hatch, E. 1976. Studies in language switching and mixing. In W.C. McCormack & S.A Wurm (eds.) *Language and man: anthropological issues*. The Hague: Mouton, 201–214.

Hirvonen, P. 1985. Investigating the language of Finnish Americans: an example of a departmental research project. In J. Tommola & K. Battarbee (eds.) *CDEF 84: Papers from the conference of departments of English in Finland*. Turku: University of Turku, 65–76.

Lanza, E. 1997. *Language mixing in infant bilingualism: a sociolinguistic perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lauttamus, T. 1991. *Borrowing, code-switching*, and *shift* in language contact: evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. In M. Ojanen & M. Palander (eds.) *Language contacts east and west*. University of Joensuu. Studies in languages 22, 32–53.

Lauttamus, T. 1992. Lainaaminen ja koodinvaihto: havaintoja amerikansuomalaisten kielestä. *Virittäjä* 1, 3–16.

Lehtinen, M. 1966. An analysis of a Finnish-English bilingual corpus. Indiana University. Doctoral dissertation.

Leopold, W.E. 1949. *Speech development of a bilingual child: a linguist's record*, Vol. iii: *grammar and general problems*. Evanston, Ill.: Northwestern University Press.

Lindholm, K. & A.M. Padilla 1978. Language mixing in bilingual children. *Journal of Child Language* 5, 327–335.

Malakoff, M. & K. Hakuta 1991. Translation skill and metalinguistic awareness. In E. Bialystok (ed.) *Language processing in bilingual children*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141–166.

Muysken, P. 1991. Needed: a comparative approach. In *Papers for the symposium on code-switching in bilingual studies: theory, significance and perspectives*. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 253–272.

Myers-Scotton, C. 1993. *Duelling languages: grammatical structure in codeswitching*.Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. & J.L. Jake 1995. Matching lemmas in a bilingual language competence and production model: evidence from intrasentential code switching. *Linguistics* 33, 981–1024.

Oksaar, E. 1972. Spoken Estonian in Sweden and the USA: an analysis of bilingual behavior. In E.S. Firchow, K. Grimstad, N. Hasselmo & W.A. O'Neil (eds.) *Studies for Einar Haugen: presented by friends and colleagues*. The Hague: Mouton, 437–449.

Pietilä, P. 1989. *The English of Finnish Americans with reference to social and psychological background factors and with special reference to age*. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis B, 188.

Poplack, S., S. Wheeler & A. Westwood 1987. Distinguishing language contact phenom ena: evidence from Finnish-English bilingualism. In P. Lilius & M. Saari (eds.) *Proceedings of the sixth international conference of nordic and general linguistics in Helsinki, 18–22 August 1986*. University of Helsinki. The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics 6, 33–56.

Sankoff, D. & S. Poplack 1981. A formal grammar for code-switching. *Papers in Linguistics* 14 (1), 3–46.

Treffers-Daller, J. 1992. A comparative perspective on language mixture. In *Code-switching summer school*. (Pavia, Italy, 9–12 September 1992.) Strasbourg: European Science Foundation, 237–249.

Woolford, E. 1983. Bilingual code-switching and syntactic theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14 (3), 20–536.